

REMARKS:

Independent Claims 9 and 25 have been allowed and remain herein unamended so that they remain in order for allowance.

Claim 8 has been amended to properly introduce the plurality of air handling devices to overcome the objection under 35 U.S.C.112 by the Examiner. Claim 8 was not rejected under 35 U.S.C.102 or 103 and thus it is believed that Claim 8 is now in good order for allowance.

Claim 19 has been amended to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C.103 and, it is respectfully submitted, is now in good order for allowance.

Thus Claim 19 has been amended to make more clear that all the components of each air handling system are connected by a respective duct so as to communicate air therebetween. Thus, it is now clear that each air handling system includes "a respective duct, a respective air intake plenum, a respective fan, a respective connection (to the exterior), a respective outlet duct and a respective air conditioning component (all of which are) connected to the respective duct for communication of air therebetween through the respective duct"

The Examiner has rejected claim 19 under 35 U.S.C.103 based on Wi, Siccardi, and Bohanon in view of Meckler.

In the first three references there is no disclosure of independent air handling systems and the Examiner thus is relying, in regard to the independent air handling system of this claim, on the disclosure of Meckler. This is acknowledged by the Examiner on page 3 at the line which is four from the bottom.

Claim 19 is distinguished from Meckler for two reasons. Expressed simply these are:

Firstly that Meckler discloses separate HVAC systems for separate zones or spaces of a building. Meckler does NOT disclose that a common zone containing a plurality of benches has for each bench a separate air handling system. Thus, it is of course common that a building has a series of different and separate zones, such as separate floors of the building and separate suites in the building which have separate HVAC systems. This is ALL that Meckler discloses. The figures clearly show separate floors of the building. Column 1, line 32 clearly says that each "services a separate conditioned zone".

In the present invention a single greenhouse forming a SINGLE ZONE contains benches which are of course not separated each from the next within the single zone and each bench has its own air handling system.

If one therefore combines the teaching of Takano and Meckler one would simply provide a greenhouse having separate sections divided by walls, or on different floors, as in Meckler and would provide for each section provide an air handling system. This combination does not teach the present invention where each bench has its own air handling system.

Secondly the invention as defined includes in each air handling system a duct and an air outlet to the exterior which is connected into the same duct as the air inlet and air outlet of the duct. In Figure 1 of Meckler there is to each of the three zones Z an air outlet 69 which is not connected to the same duct as the A/C A and also an outlet 12 which is connected to a common system including the pre-conditioner C. Thus

in Meckler each separate zone has its own A/C system A connected into a duct 10/11. But this duct (shown by the air directions "SA" and "RA") does NOT have a connection to the outside. Instead the connection to the outside is provided through the common system 11, 12 and C. (The Examiner will note some confusion is caused by the fact that reference numeral 11 has been used twice for different items but it will be understood that the system through each A/C A is individual for each zone whereas there is a common system to the exterior for all zones through the air pre-conditioner C.)

If one therefore combines the greenhouse and benches of the first three references with the teaching of Meckler, separate zones of the greenhouse will have a common system communicating to the exterior, which is clearly different from the invention as defined in (and now made more clear in amended) Claim 20.

It is well established in MPEP paragraph 2143 that, in order to establish a prima facie case of obviousness, the Examiner must show prior art documents which in combination teach or suggest ALL the claim limitations. The Examiner therefore has no prior art document which discloses or suggests this feature of the common duct for the bench including also the exterior connection, so that a prima facie case of obviousness for rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103 has not been established and cannot be maintained.

In addition it is submitted that the present invention is entirely counter-intuitive in that it provides individual components as defined for the individual benches and thus apparently is an inefficient arrangement ignoring the economies of scale, so that the invention cannot be merely an obvious combination.

FROM

(THU) SEP 7 2006 15:49/ST. 15:45/NO. 6310677437 P 18

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

15

SEP 07 2006

It is submitted therefore that the combination of prior art does not disclose the combination of features now set forth in Claim 19 so that the claim is distinguished from the prior art under 35 U.S.C.103 and should be allowed.

It is submitted therefore that all claims now presented are in good order for allowance.

Respectfully submitted

DAVID BRADY ET AL

PER: 

Adrian D. Battison

Registration No: 31,726

ADB/II

September 7, 2006

Enc.(2)

Adrian D. Battison

Winnipeg, Manitoba, Canada

Telephone (204) 944-0032 - FAX (204) 942-5723

CERTIFICATION OF FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that this paper is being facsimile transmitted to the United States Patent and Trademark Office, Fax No. (571) 273-8300, on September 7, 2006

Lynn Leatherdale

